

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/114,352	07/13/1998	TOMOKO TERAKADO	SONY-P8770 '	9117
22850	7590 03/27/2003			
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			EXAMINER	
	1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		KOENIG, ANDREW Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2611	. 1
				11.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/114,352	TERAKADO ET AL.
,	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew Y Koenig	2611
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 27 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice I) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	,
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date or FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee efee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below):
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by		•
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se	r reconsideration has been cons e Continuation Sheet.	sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		•
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:		
•		
Patent and Trademark Office		

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that there is no support for "efficiently using the available bandwidth" as suggested in the rejection. The examiner disagrees; Terasawa discloses "If both the program table (brief program explanation) and the program content (detailed program explanation) are transmitted from the individual transponders for a long period, the transmission rate of video data and audio data to be essentially transmitted would be hambered." on col. 7, II. 1-5. Accordingly, Terasawa recognizes efficiently using the available bandwidth in order to prevent a deterioration in the transmission of video signals and audio signals (col. 7, II. 14-20). Therefore, Terasawa teaches the assertion of obviousness as stated by the examiner.

The applicant argues that Hamilton discloses that text data service provided by text data service suppliers waste valuable video bandwidth and is undesirable. The examiner notes that Hamilton teaches the disclosed portions as a deficiency in the prior art. Furthermore, Hamilton teaches inserting data in the vertical blanking interval, which does not waste valuable bandwidth as argued by th applicant. Accordingly, the combination of Hamilton and Terasawa is proper.

The applicant argues that Davis teaches a flexible program schedule system to the cable operator, which would make any change to the EPG data by the cable operator erroneous. The examiner disagrees; Davis discusses the desirability of creating a flexible system in order to comply with a variety of guides.

CHRIS GRANT